


JRW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

MICHAEL A. ULESKI ET AL.



Group Art Unit: 2855

Examiner: Jermaine L. Jenkins

Serial No.: 10/700,718

Filed: November 4, 2003

For: TIRE PRESSURE SENSING COMPONENT FOR
DETECTING AIR PRESSURE AND RELATED METHOD

Attorney Docket No.: LEAR 04137 PUS

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is a response to the Office Action mailed March 14, 2005. The Examiner has restricted the claims into two groups, Group I, claims 1-14, and Group II, claims 15-20. Applicants provisionally elect the Group 1 claims, claims 1-14 with traverse.


The Office indicates that the Group I and Group II are distinct because the product could be made by another and materially different process. Applicants respectfully disagree. These inventions are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either or both (1) the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product, or (2) the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process. That is not the case here. There is no language in either of these claims 1 or 15 to indicate that the product of claim 1 could be made by another and materially different process than that of claim 15. Furthermore, the Patent Office has failed

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8

I hereby certify that this paper, including all enclosures referred to herein, is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail, postage pre-paid, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, U.S. Patent & Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

April 11, 2005
Date of Deposit

Michael S. Brodbine
Name of Person Signing


Signature

to identify even one other or materially different process than that of claim 15 to make the product of claim 1.

Moreover, the Office's demand for restriction requirement is burdensome, not only of the Patent Office and the Applicant, but also the public. Applicant will be forced to expend considerable monies for filing and prosecuting at least one additional patent application. The Office will be burdened by multiple unnecessary applications and redundant repetition of work. The public will be generally burdened by having to consider multiple applications and patents where, in reality, the need for them does not exist. There is no need to restrict these claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the requirement for restriction be withdrawn, and an early action on the merits with respect to all the claims be issued.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this application is requested. If the Examiner notes any minor errors, he is invited to telephone the undersigned so that the matter can be promptly handled by Examiner's amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL A. ULESKI ET AL.

By: 

Michael S. Brodbine
Reg. No. 38,392
Attorney for Applicant

Date: April 11, 2005

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: (248) 358-4400
Fax: (248) 358-3351